

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 2-10 are pending in the application, with claims 2, 5, and 7-10 being the independent claims.

Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2-4, 5-6, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over combinations of U.S. Patent 6,321,073 to Luz *et al.* (“Luz”); U.S. Patent 4,985,767 to Haghiri *et al.* (“Haghiri”); U.S. Patent 6,161,004 to Galal *et al.* (“Galal”); and U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0114413 to Zarubinsky *et al.* (“Zarubinsky”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

In common, these rejections rely on an allegation by the Examiner that Haghiri “discloses a receiver including delay measurement means 1913a, 1913b and 1913c coupled to a demodulator operable to determine delay vectors.” In particular, the Examiner refers to FIG. 19 and col. 17, lines 23-39 of Haghiri.

Applicants assert that circuits 1913a, 1913b, and 1913c of Haghiri are not delay measurement means as alleged by the Examiner. On the contrary, as disclosed in col. 17, lines 23-31 of Haghiri, circuits 1913a, 1913b, and 1913c are delay circuits that introduce delays rather than measure delays. Accordingly, Haghiri does not teach or suggest a “delay measurement means” to determine a delay vector, as recited in

independent claims 2 and 5. Nor does Haghiri teach or suggest “determining a signal delay” that characterizes in-phase and quadrature phase components of a DC offset, as recited in independent claims 8 and 10.

The other cited references do not overcome the deficiencies of Haghiri as described above.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 2-4, 5-6, 8 and 10 are patentable over the cited references. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2-4, 5-6, 8 and 10 is respectfully requested.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zarubinsky in view of U.S. Patent 4,816,769 to Ma *et al.* (“Ma”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In rejecting claim 9, the Examiner alleges that Zarubinsky discloses a method that includes “setting the gain of an automatic gain control, increasing the gain of the automatic gain control stage by a predetermined amount, and repeating these steps until the signal levels of the in-phase and quadrature phase components are greater than or equal to the predetermined minimum threshold value.” In particular, the Examiner refers to paragraphs [0028], [0030], [0031], [0089], and [0092] of Zarubinsky.

Applicants carefully examined Zarubinsky but found no reference to the alleged teachings by the Examiner. In particular, paragraphs [0028]-[0031] of Zarubinsky disclose using a gain controller 200 to control the gain of an amplifier 205 placed in front of the quadrature channel 292 of a radio circuit 299, to ensure that the

in-phase and quadrature channels of radio circuit 299 have substantially equal gains. However, paragraphs [0028]-[0031] of Zarubinsky do not teach or suggest using an automatic gain controller. Nor do paragraphs [0028]-[0031] of Zarubinsky teach or suggest increasing the gain of the automatic gain controller by a predetermined amount and repeating steps until the signal levels of the in-phase and quadrature phase components are greater than or equal to the predetermined minimum threshold value, as recited in claim 9.

As to paragraphs [0089]-[0092] of Zarubinsky, which the Examiner also refers to in rejecting claim 9, they disclose how a gain control signal W that is provided to amplifier 205 is calculated. The same paragraphs also disclose that the gain control signal W affects a gain L of amplifier 205, such that the gain L is increased or decreased when a difference exists between the gains of the in-phase and quadrature channels. However, nowhere do paragraphs [0089]-[0092] of Zarubinsky teach or suggest using an automatic gain controller. Nor do paragraphs [0089]-[0092] of Zarubinsky teach or suggest increasing the gain of the automatic gain controller by a predetermined amount and repeating steps until the signal levels of the in-phase and quadrature phase components are greater than or equal to the predetermined minimum threshold value, as recited in claim 9.

Accordingly, Zarubinsky does not teach or suggest at least the above described features of claim 9. Ma does not overcome the deficiencies of Zarubinsky as described.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 9 is patentable over Zarubinsky and Ma. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 9 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Robert Sokohl
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 36,013

Date: 9/14/07

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600
689783_1.DOC